DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 096 598 CG 009 371

AUTHOR Thorsell, Bernard; Chambers, Robert
TITLE The Adjudication Process and Self-Conception.
PUB DATE Aug 74
NOTE 25p.; Presented at the American Psychological Association Annual Conference (New Orleans, Louisiana, August, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Court Litigation; *Cultural Factors; *Delinquents; Psychological Characteristics; Racial Differences; *Self Concept; *Sociocultural Patterns; Speeches; Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

The hypothesis that the adjudication process changes self-conception was explored by analyzing responses to the Twenty Statements Test. Self-conceptions of adjudicated male juvenile offenders were found to be significantly more negative than those of male juvenile non-offenders. White offenders exhibited the most negative self-conceptions, chicano offenders ranked next, and black offenders displayed self-conceptions as positive as those of non-offenders. The hypothesis was shown to apply to adjudicated offenders as a group but not to hold across race and ethnic lines. The ethnic differences found can be explained by noting the social meaning of the adjudication process in each ethnic community. (Author)

ED 096598

THE ADJUDICATION PROCESS AND SELF-CONCEPTION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Bernard Thorsell
California State University,
Northridge

Robert Chambers
Honolulu, Hawaii

Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Psychological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, August 30-September 3, 1974.

CG 009 371

THE PROBLEM. Differences in self-conception between juveniles who have undergone the adjudication process, i.e., arrest, hearing and judgement, and those who have not experienced it have been the subject of considerable speculation but relatively little empirical study. A review of the literature indicates one study in this area by Fannin and Clinard[1] which suggests a relationship between type of self-conception and type of delinquent behavior. Lower class delinquents were found to view themselves as tough, fearless, powerful, fierce, and dangerous in contrast to middle-class delinquents who conceived of themselves as smart, smooth, bad, and loyal. The lower class delinquents were also found to have committed violent offenses significantly more often than the middle-class offenders. In another series of studies, Reckless and his associates[2] suggest that the non-delinquent is insulated against delinquency by a favorable self-concept. The delinquent is seen as possessing an unfavorable self-concept which not only fails to provide any such insulation but also actually serves to propel him into delinquent behavior.

Several investigations in this area reported by Fitts and Hamner[3] have produced further relevant findings. These studies report significant differences in self-conception between delinquent and non-delinquent youth, as measured by the Tennessee Self Concept Scale. This is a clinical scale consisting of one hundred self-appraising statements which yield twenty-nine different scores on five sub-scales. The sub-scales are physical self, moral-ethical self, personal self-worth, self in relation to primary groups, and self in relation to secondary groups.[4]

The principal findings of these studies indicate that delinquents, as a group, show self-conceptions that are significantly more negative than those exhibited by non-delinquents, and that these differences pertain regardless of age, sex, intelligence, education, race, geographical area, and nature of offense.

These results of the Fitts and Hamner studies lend support to the so-called "labeling" approach to delinquency.[5] This approach contends that the adjudication process is a degrading social experience that necessarily involves the public labeling of the juvenile as an undesirable deviant, and sets in motion a series of social and psychological processes which isolate him from normal social contacts and bring about a redefinition of himself as a deviant person.[6] An important part of this contention is the assumption that this change in self-conception is more or less uniform across all social and cultural lines. Unfortunately, because no attempt has been made in the Fitts and Hamner research to study delinquents in terms of their social and cultural differences, this assumption cannot be evaluated by the results of these studies. At the same time, it seems reasonable that the adjudication process may <u>not</u> be uniformly associated with changes in self-conception across all social and cultural lines. For example, the "machismo" phenomenon[7] among chicano males could conceivably serve either to lessen or to aggravate the effects of the process upon chicano delinquents. Similarly, the equivocal role of the male in the black community raises comparable questions for that ethnic group. These observations suggest the possibility of important differences in self-conception not only

between delinquents and non-delinquents but also between delinquents of different ethnic backgrounds. An investigation of the nature and scope of such differences, if they do exist, should expand our knowledge of the relationship between self-conception and delinquent behavior as well as the effects of the adjudication process.

THE METHOD. In order to investigate these issues systematically, a study designed to explore them empirically was undertaken. On the basis of the observations made above, two research hypotheses were formulated to guide the investigation. First, juvenile offenders who have experienced the adjudication process, should exhibit self-conceptions which are clearly and significantly more negative than those of juveniles who have never experienced the process. Second, the degree of negativeness of self-conception should be shown to be significantly related to ethnic background.

Because of a lack of skill and experience in the clinical task of scoring and interpreting the Tennessee scale, its use in the study was ruled out. At the same time, the Twenty Statements Test, a technique developed by Kuhn and McPartland[8] for analyzing self-conception within the framework of symbolic interactionism, seemed to be conceptually well suited to the task. This technique requires the subject to give twenty short statements which best answer the question, "Who Am I?" for him. The test assumes that self-conception is an internalization and organization of identities which significant others have attributed, or are currently attributing to the subject, combined with the results of interactions

based on these identities. It also assumes that the subject sees himself involved in social action and that he organizes his behavior symbolically to fit his conceptions of himself, of the situation in which action takes place, and of other actors in the situation.[9] In addition, the ease of administration of the test and the "direct" nature of the data it provides were thought to be important practical considerations. Accordingly, the Kuhn and McPartland technique of analyzing self-conception was selected for use in this study.

The Twenty Statements Test was administered to twenty-three fourteen- and fifteen-year old male residents of the San Fernando Valley Juvenile Hall, Sylmar, California, fifty-nine eleven- to seventeen-year old male residents of the Ventura Juvenile Hall, Ventura, California,[10] and to seventy-five fourteen- and fifteen-year old male students at Luther Burbank Junior High School, Burbank, California. The juvenile offenders were chosen at random from the living units in the juvenile halls where they were being detained after having been arrested. The total offender group was composed of forty-seven white, sixteen black, and nineteen chicano boys. It was assumed that they all had experienced the psychological and social impacts of the adjudication process. At the same time, it seemed unlikely that they had moved significantly into a well-defined, crystallized delinquent career. This is strongly suggested by the fact that none of the boys was scheduled to be sent to a state correctional facility. Apparently, it was believed that they were still vulnerable to further "corruption" and, therefore, could benefit from the counselling and educational

programs available in the county facilities. The junior high students chosen were average white students at a more or less typical white, suburban junior high school, none of whom, to the best of the knowledge of the authors, had been exposed to any formal adjudication experience.

Each member of the offender and the non-offender groups was asked to reply to the question, "Who am I?", by giving twenty short written answers which best described him. Approximately twenty minutes were allowed to complete the task and the boys were encouraged to work quickly, writing down whatever first came to mind. The formal instructions were as follows:

> "Please write twenty answers to the question, 'Who am I?' Just give twenty different answers to this question. Write your answers in the order that they occur to you. Go along fairly fast; time is limited."

Four major categories of responses emerged in a content analysis of the answers. These were used to organize the data. The first of these categories, physical characteristics, includes all responses which the respondent used to render a physical description of himself, such as sex, height, weight, age. The second, social role, embraces all responses which dealt with self-description in terms of a social role or a place in a social grouping, such as family or school. The third, interests, likes, and dislikes, consists of all responses dealing with personal interests, likes, and dislikes or personal possessions. The fourth, self-conception, embodies all responses which express what the respondent thinks of himself and how others, such as teachers or friends, evaluate him. A further analysis of the

responses falling into the category, self-conception, was then undertaken. These answers were classified for all respondents into three sub-categories: positive, such as, "I am popular," negative, such as "I am ugly," and neutral, such as, "I am me," or "I am average."

In order to evaluate the research hypotheses quantitatively, a series of analyses utilizing X^2 technique was performed to determine the degree of association between the self-evaluative responses of offenders versus non-offenders and the self-evaluations of offenders versus ethnic status. This was done for the three sub-categories of responses used in analyzing the the self-evaluative answers. In each case, the null hypothesis of no association between the self-conception responses and each of the two statuses was tested. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 1 through 7.

THE FINDINGS. Table 1 reveals differences between the total offender group and the non-offender group that are very definitive. Whereas the self-conception statements of the junior high boys are decidedly more positive than negative, those of the juvenile hall youths are clearly more negative than positive. It is obvious that the offenders evidence decidedly more negative self-conceptions than do the non-offenders. Further, as shown in the table, these differences are statistically significant. X^2 computed for the degree of association between the self-conceptions of offenders and non-offenders is significant at the .001 level.

In order to examine these findings in greater detail, comparisons between the self-evaluative responses of each of the

three ethnic categories of offenders (white, black, chicano) and the self-evaluations of the non-offenders were undertaken. Again, this was done for the three sub-categories used in analyzing the self-conception responses. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 2, 3, and 4.

A comparison of Tables 1 and 2 shows that the distribution of responses across the three sub-categories is very similar for both white offenders and the offender group as a whole. Essentially the same ratio of positive to negative responses pertains for the white offenders as for the offender group as a whole. Table 2 shows that X^2 computed for the degree of association between the self-conceptions of the white offenders and the non-offenders is significant at the .001 level.

A comparison of Tables 1 and 3 indicates a ratio of positive to negative self-evaluations for chicano respondents similar to that of the offender group as a whole. Table 3 shows that X^2 computed for the degree of association between the self-conceptions of the chicano offenders and the non-offenders is significant at the .001 level.

An inspection of Tables 1 and 4, however, reveals a marked dissimilarity between the distributions of responses for black offenders and for the offender group as a whole. Moreover, Table 4 shows a clear similarity between the responses of the black offenders and the non-offenders. In no case is there more than a 1.8% difference between the two groups in the proportions of responses falling in each of the three sub-categories. In short, the distributions of responses for the two groups are

virtually identical. X^2 computed for the degree of association between these variables is obviously not significant. This contrasts sharply with the statistically significant differences shown to exist for these categories between both the white and chicano offenders and the junior high non-offenders.

In order to explore these ethnic differences further, comparisons between the self-conceptions of the three ethnic categories of offenders were carried out. As before, this was done for the three sub-categories used in analyzing the self-evaluative responses. The results of these analyses are presented in Tables 5 through 7.

Table 5 contrasts dramatically the marked differences in negativeness of self-conception between white and black offenders that were noted earlier. White offenders show self-conceptions that are clearly more negative than positive, whereas black offenders reveal self-conceptions that are decidedly more positive than negative. The table also indicates that X^2 computed for the degree of association between self-conception and these ethnic differences is significant at the .001 level.

Table 6 shows important differences in degree of negativeness of self-conception between chicano and black offenders. Very much like the differences in self-conception that were found to exist between white and black offenders, the self-conceptions of chicano offenders are clearly more negative than positive in contrast to those of the black offenders which have been shown to be decidedly more positive than negative. The table also indicates that X^2

computed for the degree of association between self-conception and these ethnic differences is significant at the .001 level.

Finally, Table 7 indicates an absence of any significant differences in negativeness of self-conception between white and chicano offenders. Both white and chicano offenders exhibit self-conceptions that are clearly more negative than positive and show an almost identical ratio of negative to positive responses. The table also indicates that X^2 computed for the degree of association between self-conception and these ethnic differences reaches only the .30 level and is obviously not significant.

INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS. Both of the research hypotheses of this study have been given support by the results of the data analysis. The first hypothesis is given support by the finding of statistically significant differences in the degree of negativeness of self-conception between the offender group as a whole and the junior high non-offenders. Further, as the data analysis indicates, these differences are not explainable in terms of the responses of any one of the ethnic subgroups studied. Moreover, these differences are definitive despite the unpredicted showing by black offenders of self-conceptions that are highly positive and virtually identical to those of the non-offenders. To this extent, the findings of this study lend significant support to the "labeling" contention that the adjudication process typically changes the self-conceptions of adjudicated persons. In the cases of the white and chicano offenders, for example, a substantial deterioration in the positive quality of their self-conceptions appears to have taken place as a result of the adjudication process.

The second hypothesis, which predicted a significant degree of association between negativeness of self-conception and ethnic status, is strongly supported by the data shown in Tables 5 and 6. At the same time, the data of Table 7 fail to support the hypothesis altogether. A further examination of these findings indicates that the ethnic groups represented can be ranked in terms of degree of negativeness of self-conception. A comparison of the percentages of negative to positive self-evaluative responses for each group makes the ranking clear. White offenders rank first with 58.2% negative and 32.8% positive responses, chicano offenders rank second with 52.8% negative and 33.1% positive responses, and black offenders rank last in degree of negativeness of self-conception with only 22.5% negative and 67.6% positive responses.

Thus, the findings of this research lend some support to the "labeling" contention that the adjudication process typically results in a change in self-conception on the part of adjudication persons. They also tend to support the finding by Fitts and Hamner that juvenile offenders exhibit more negative self-conception than do juvenile non-offenders. However, the finding of a decidedly more positive than negative self-conception on the part of black offenders is completely inconsistent with the contention that the adjudication experience typically generates a negative self-conception, and it stands in sharp contradiction to the conclusion by Fitts and Hamner that a negative self-conception is characteristic of all youthful offenders. The data of Tables 5 and 6 make it clear that black offenders exhibit self-conceptions that are markedly more positive than negative and significantly different

from the highly negative self-conceptions of the white or the chicano offenders. Moreover, the rank order differences in negativeness of self-conception according to ethnic status cannot easily be accounted for by either the clinical approach of Fitts and Hamner or the "labeling" approach.

If one assumes with Fitts and Hamner that the negative self-conceptions evidenced by the juvenile offenders existed prior to their participation in the offenses for which they were arrested, brought to court, and placed in the juvenile hall, it can then be assumed that such negative self-conceptions are the cause rather than the result of the delinquency and the subsequent adjudication experience.[11] However, such an explanation fails to account for either the almost identical patterns of self-evaluation shown by the non-offenders and the black offenders or the rank order differences in self-conception by ethnic status found in this study.

Clearly, these findings are not easily accounted for in terms of the traditional clinical approach to delinquency. But neither are they readily resolved by invoking the "labeling" contention that the adjudication experience changes self-conception. Whereas the clinical approach assumes that delinquency is the result of prior learning and resultant emotional and/or cognitive pathology, the "labeling" contention depicts delinquent states of mind as the product of the adjudication experience. If one attempts to interpret the findings of this research in terms of the "labeling" approach, the decidedly positive self-conceptions of the black offenders and the ethnic rank order of self-conceptions remain

as cryptic in this theoretical framework as in the clinical context.

However, some light can be cast on this matter by noting that there is reason to believe that the impact of involvement with social control agencies may be quite different for black persons than for non-black persons. The adjudication experience does not appear to have the same subjective meaning or impact for the black person as for other persons. In this study, the subjective reaction to the experience on the part of the white and chicano offenders seems to involve a questioning of personal worth and an internalization of the rejection of the society. These can be assumed to be consistent with the values, attitudes, and world view of their respective ethnic communities. For the black offender, however, the outcome of the experience seems to be quite different. Rather than being denigratory, as in the case of the white and chicano offenders, it appears to be protective of one's self-conception. This has been suggested, for example, by Eldridge Cleaver in a somewhat different context. As Cleaver observes:

> "One thing that the judges, policemen and administrators seem never to have understood, and for which they certainly do not make any allowances, is that Negro convicts, basically, rather than see themselves as criminals and perpetrators of misdeeds, look upon themselves as prisoners of war, the victims of a vicious dog-eat-dog social system that is so heinous as to cancel out their own malefactions; in the jungle there is no right or wrong.
>
> "Rather than owing and paying a debt to society, Negro prisoners feel that they are being abused, that their imprisonment is simply another form of the oppression which they have known all their lives. Negro inmates feel that they are being robbed, that it is 'society' that owes them, that should be paying them a debt."[12]

If Cleaver's observations are accurate, it seems reasonable to assume that the black offenders studied in this research took on such values, attitudes, and world view early in life. Accordingly, the process of arrest, trial, and detention and the public labeling involved would not be viewed by them as a degrading social experience but as an arbitrary exercise of political power on the part of the oppressive white majority. Hence, the adjudication process is not an occasion for the taking on of negative self-evaluations. Instead, it is simply another contingency with which the black person must be prepared to deal in his everyday life. Moreover, it is a contingency for which his socialization experiences and his identity as a black person have prepared him well. This seems to be reflected in the positive self-conceptions exhibited in the responses of the black offenders in this study.

At the same time, it can be assumed that the white and the chicano offenders studied have undergone entirely different socialization experiences and have developed entirely separate ethnic identities. With both the white and chicano offenders, it can be assumed that they have been taught to regard the process of arrest, trial, and detention as a demeaning social experience. This is reflected in the negative self-conceptions they have exhibited in their responses on the test. It should be noted that the phenomenon of "machismo" may enable the chicano offender to project a self-conception in his responses that reflects the values of manliness and honor despite his true sense of self-worth. If this is so, he would be expected to show a less negative self-

conception than his "anglo" counterpart, as found in this research.

These observations concerning the differences in the social meanings of the adjudication process in the black, white, and chicano communities make it possible to provide an explanation of the virtual identity of the self-conceptions of the black offenders and the non-offenders, as well as an explanation of the ethnic rank order of self-conceptions, found in this study. By utilizing these local social meanings of the adjudication process as intervening variables, it has been possible to supplement the established clinical and "labeling" approaches so as to expand our knowledge of the relationship between self-conception and delinquency significantly. However, given the limited nature of the sample and the analytical tools utilized in this research, these interpretations and conclusions should be viewed as somewhat tentative. Therefore, the results of this study are reported as suggestive findings that might be provocative of further study of the ethnic dimensions of self-conception as they relate to deviant behavior as well as the impact of the adjudication process on self-conception.

Finally, the results of this research suggest that considerable caution should be exercised in applying generalizations concerning the nature and causes of deviant behavior across ethnic and perhaps other social and cultural lines as well. While both the established clinical and "labeling" approaches to the analysis of deviance have been given some support by the overall results of this study, their failure to account for the ethnic variations that have been uncovered make it clear that they are not readily applicable in their

present form to all cases of deviance. Apparently, the present "states of the art" of these approaches are sufficiently undeveloped so that they simply fail to account readily for variations in self-conception of the sort encountered in this study. Clearly, the sources of such variations lie deep within the values, beliefs, and life circumstances of the ethnic groups represented. If these established approaches to the analysis of deviant behavior are to remain viable and provocative, they must be expanded and elaborated upon so that they can cope more effectively with social and cultural differences of this kind. Obviously, this calls for theoretical and empirical study on a much broader and more extensive scale than it has been possible to accomplish in this study.

FOOTNOTES

1. L. Fannin and M. B. Clinard, "Differences in the conception of self as a male among lower and middle-class delinquents." Social Problems, Vol. 13, 1965, pp. 205-214.

2. See W. C. Reckless, S. Dinitz, and E. Murray, "Self concept as an insulator against delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 21, 1956, pp. 744-746; also, W. C. Reckless, S. Dinitz, and B. Kay, "The self component in potential non-delinquency." American Sociological Review, Vol. 22, 1957, pp. 566-570, and, E. L. Lively, S. Dinitz, and W. C. Reckless, "Self concept as a predictor of juvenile delinquency." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 32(1), 1962, pp. 159-168.

3. W. H. Fitts and W. T. Hamner, The Self Concept and Delinquency. Research Monograph #1. Nashville, Tennessee, National Mental Health Center, 1969.

4. Ibid., pp. 1-5.

5. See, for example, Howard S. Becker, Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance. London, Free Press, 1963; Kai Erickson, "The sociology of deviance." Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1962, pp. 307-314; John Kitsuse, "Societal reaction and deviant behavior: problems of method and theory." Social Problems, Vol. 9, No. 4, 1962, pp. 247-256; Edwin M. Lemert, Social Pathology. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1951, and Human Deviance, Social Problems, and Social Control. Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1967; Thomas J. Scheff, Being Mentally Ill: A Sociological Theory. Chicago, Aldine, 1966.

6. The contention that these are typical sequelae of this "labeling" is open to question. A recent paper suggests that there is reason to believe that such "labeling" may have deterrent as well as reinforcing effects upon the labeled person's behavior, depending upon the nature of the deviance and the social and interpersonal circumstances involved. See Bernard A. Thorsell and Lloyd W. Klemke, "The labeling process: reinforcement and deterrent?" Law and Society Review, Vol. 6, No. 3, 1972, pp. 393-403.

7. See, for example, Aniceto Aramoni, "Machismo," Psychology Today, January, 1972; also Celia Heller, Mexican American Youth: Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York, Random House, 1966.

8. Manford H. Kuhn and Thomas S. McPartland, "An empirical investigation of self-attitudes." American Sociological Review, Vol. 19, 1954, pp. 68-76; also Carl J. Couch, "Self-attitudes and degree of agreement with immediate others." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 63, 1958, pp. 491-496.

9. See Thomas S. McPartland, John H. Cummings, and Wynona S. Garretson, "Self conception and ward behavior in two psychiatric hospitals." Sociometry, Vol. 24, 1961, pp. 111-124.

10. The authors are deeply indebted to Mr. Thomas Meng of the Ventura Juvenile Hall for his cooperation and invaluable assistance in gathering this portion of the data used in this research.

11. See, for example, Fitts and Hamner, op. cit.; also Jonathan L. Freedman and Anthony N. Doob, Deviancy: The Psychology of Being Different. New York, Academic Press, 1968.

12. Eldridge Cleaver, Soul on Ice. New York, Delta Dell, 1968, p. 88.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

APPENDIX

TABLES 1 - 7

TABLE I

ALL JUVENILE OFFENDERS vs. NON-OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
All Offenders: No. Responses	152(205)	204(154)	48(47)	404	58
All Offenders: Percentages	37.6%	50.5%	11.9%	100.0%	
Non-Offenders: No. Responses	201(148)	61(111)	33(34)	295	42
Non-Offenders: Percentages	68.1%	11.2%	20.7%	100.0%	
Totals	353(353)	265(265)	81(81)	699	100

$X^2 = 71.39$

DF = 2

$P < .001$*

*X^2 must be at least 13.815 to establish significance at the .001 level with two degrees of freedom.

V

TABLE 2

WHITE JUVENILE OFFENDERS vs. NON-OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
White Offenders: No. Responses	82(130)	144(94)	22(25)	248	46
White Offenders: Percentages	32.8%	58.2%	9.0%	100.0%	
Non-Offenders: No. Responses	201(153)	61(111)	33(30)	295	54
Non-Offenders: Percentages	68.1%	20.7%	11.2%	100.0%	
Totals	283(283)	205(205)	55(55)	543	100

$X^2 = 82.56$

DF = 2

$P < .001$*

* See note on Table 1.

TABLE 3

CHICANO OFFENDERS vs. NON-OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
Chicano Offenders: No. Responses	22(42)	35(18)	10(8)	67	19
Chicano Offenders: Percentages	33.1%	52.8%	14.1%	100.0%	
Non-Offenders: No. Responses	201(181)	61(78)	33(35)	295	81
Non-Offenders: Percentages	68.1%	20.7%	11.2%	100.0%	
Totals	223(223)	96(96)	43(43)	362	100

$X^2 = 34.55$

DF = 2

$P < .001$*

*See note on Table 1.

TABLE 4

BLACK OFFENDERS vs. NON-OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
Black Offenders: No. Responses	48(47)	16(15)	7(8)	71	19
Black Offenders: Percentages	67.6%	22.5%	9.9%	100.0%	
Non-Offenders: No. Responses	201(202)	61(62)	33(32)	295	81
Non-Offenders: Percentages	68.1%	20.7%	11.2%	100.0%	
Totals	249(249)	77(77)	40(40)	366	100

$X^2 = 0.27$

DF = 2

$P > .80$*

*X^2 at the .80 level with two degrees of freedom = 0.446.

TABLE 5

BLACK OFFENDERS vs. WHITE OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
Black: No. Responses	48(29)	16(35)	7(6)	71	22
Black: Percentages	67.6%	22.5%	9.9%	100.0%	
White: No. Responses	82(101)	144(125)	22(23)	248	78
White: Percentages	32.8%	58.2%	9.0%	100.0%	
Totals	130(130)	160(160)	29(29)	319	100

X^2: 29.44

DF: 2

P: $< .001$*

* See Note on Table 1.

TABLE 6

BLACK OFFENDERS vs. CHICANO OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
Black: No. Responses	48(36)	16(26)	7(9)	71	51
Black: Percentages	67.6%	22.5%	9.9%	100.0%	
Chicano: No. Responses	22(34)	35(25)	10(8)	67	49
Chicano: Percentages	33.1%	52.8%	14.1%	100.0%	
Totals	70(70)	51(51)	17(17)	138	100

X^2: 17.03

DF: 2

P: < .001*

* See Note on Table 1.

TABLE 7

CHICANO OFFENDERS vs. WHITE OFFENDERS
SELF-CONCEPTION RESPONSES

	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Totals	%
Chicano: No. Responses	22(22)	35(38)	10(7)	67	21
Chicano: Percentages	33.1%	52.8%	14.1%	100.0%	
White: No. Responses	82(82)	144(141)	22(25)	248	79
White: Percentages	32.8%	58.2%	9.0%	100.0%	
Totals	104(104)	179(179)	32(32)	315	100

X^2: 1.950

DF: 2

P: > .30

*X^2 at the .30 level with two degrees of freedom = 2.408.